



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A. 1916A 306. The words "in the course of" are held to apply to the time, place, and circumstances under which the injury takes place. There is more difficulty in determining whether the injury "arises out of" the employment, that is, in establishing the causal connection between the employment and the injury. *Mueller Construction Co. v. Industrial Board of Illinois*, 283 Ill. 148, 118 N. E. 1028.

An injury "arises out of" an employment when it occurs in the course of the employment, and is a natural and necessary incident or consequence of it, though not foreseen or expected. *Larke v. John Hancock Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 90 Conn. 303, 97 Atl. 320, L. R. A. 1916E 584. Only those accidents are embraced which happen to a servant while he is engaged in the discharge of some function or duty which he is authorized to undertake, and which is calculated to further, directly or indirectly, the master's business. The injury must be reasonably incident to the employment. *Fitzgerald v. Clarke*, [1908] 2 K. B. 796, 1 B. W. C. C. 197.

"If one employee assaults another employee, solely to gratify his feeling of anger or hatred, the injury results from the voluntary act of the assailant, and cannot be said to arise either directly out of the employment or as an incident of it." *Jacquemin v. Turner, etc., Co.*, 92 Conn. 382, 103 Atl. 115, L. R. A. 1918E 496. In the present case not only was the injury caused by the voluntary attack of the assailant, but also, the plaintiff instigated the altercation. The resulting assault, then, proceeded from a risk not originated by or "arising out of" the employment. Moreover, in provoking the assault, the plaintiff performed no duty for his master, but, on the contrary, deserted that duty for personal ends, and thereby stepped out of his employment. *Griffin v. Roberson*, 162 N. Y. Supp. 313; *Union Sanitary Mfg. Co. v. Davis*, 64 Ind. App. 227, 115 N. E. 676.

See L. R. A. 1916A 40, 240, for full discussion of injuries "arising out of and in the course of" employment. See also 3 VA. LAW REV. 232, 6 VA. LAW REV. 67.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—POLICE POWER—BUILDING LINES.—A State statute gave a city the power to establish building lines within its limits and did not provide for compensation to the owner of property fronting on the streets where such lines were established. The defendants were interested in the development of a certain tract of land in the city and laid out plans and sold lots on newly formed streets without regard to the building lines as established by the city. The city brought suit to restrain them from further opening such streets or selling lots fronting thereon. The defendants claimed that the statute in question was void as providing for the taking of property without due process of law—compensation not being provided for. The city contended that this was a proper exercise of the police power. *Held*, that the defendants be restrained. *Town of Windsor v. Whitney* (Conn.), 111 Atl. 354. See NOTES, p. 649.

NUISANCE—INJUNCTION—COTTON GIN.—Plaintiffs acquired homes in that part of a town which was known as the "ginning" section. To the